

## [The Knowledge Bank at The Ohio State University](#)

**Feature Title:** ДѢЛО КЪНИЖЬНОЕ Dielo k"nizh'noie

**Article Title:** Text-Oriented Indices to Early Slavic Manuscripts

**Article Author:** Veder, William R.

**Journal Title:** *Polata Knigopisnaia*

**Issue Date:** June 1984

**Publisher:** William R. Veder, Vakgroep Slavistiek, Katholieke Universiteit, Postbus 9103, 6500 HD Nijmegen (Holland)

**Citation:** *Polata Knigopisnaia: an Information Bulletin Devoted to the Study of Early Slavic Books, Texts and Literatures* 9 (June 1984): 68-74.

**Appears in:**

**Community:** [Hilandar Research Library](#)

**Sub-Community:** [Polata Knigopisnaia](#)

**Collection:** [Polata Knigopisnaia: Volume 9 \(June 1984\)](#)

## TEXT-ORIENTED INDICES TO EARLY SLAVIC MANUSCRIPTS

WILLIAM R. VEDER

All extant indices to early Slavic manuscripts serve a single purpose: to indicate as precisely as possible where a given element can be found in the manuscript the index pertains to. Usually, they list proper nouns, in some cases all the words and forms, more rarely, chiefly in older editions, biblical references as well. Is this satisfactory? I think not.

My work on early Slavic compilations has convinced me that a different approach to both the purpose and the scope of indices should be envisaged, and my work on the edition of early Slavic florilegia bears testimony that this can be accomplished with no more than minor sacrifices to the ease of locating elements indexed and minor additional effort. Both the slight sacrifice and the extra effort will be amply rewarded: they will turn the indices into independent research instruments, to be used for more purposes than the mere location of elements in the manuscripts they pertain to.

The principal adjustment to be made, is to dissociate manuscripts and their contents. Manuscripts are unique, texts not usually. For the purpose of comparative study, they each require different reference systems: manuscripts — one based on the material units of which they are made up, texts — one based on the sequential units into which they are divided by the scribe. Manuscript units are equal in size, textual units not usually — they may vary, by comparison to manuscript units, from less than a line to several folia in length. If the latter are used as a basis for indices to the contents of a manuscript, locating a given element in the manuscript may, indeed, take a little more time than with the traditional manuscript-oriented reference system. Yet if this sacrifice is made, texts and their configurations will become comparable independently of the manuscripts they are actually preserved in.

Text-oriented reference systems are currently in use only for Bible books (book:chapter:verse) and Paterika (name:apophthegm or chapter:apophthegm). For the vast majority of Slavic manuscripts a text-oriented reference system will have to be devised. The simplest and least prejudiced system consists in the consecutive numbering of all divisions of the contents of a manuscript, that are marked by a capital letter and/or preceded by a

lacuna, a terminal sign or a title. It respects the structure of the contents as laid out by the scribes, while at the same time providing the possibility to refer to the texts (and their lacunae) in a short, efficient manner for the purposes of both indexation and comparative study.

Additional effort is required to relate the text-oriented reference system to the manuscript-oriented system. This, however, yields two new types of indices with important informative and comparative potential: an *incipitarium* and a *codicological index*. The incipitarium contains all consecutively numbered subdivisions of the contents, represented by their initial words and provided with an indication of their location in the manuscript; it is eminently suited for quick reference to and orientation in the contents, as well as for fundamental structural comparison to similar text configurations in other manuscripts. The codicological index contains a survey of the material organization of the manuscript (quires and their numbering, folia, lacunae) and the distribution of scribes' hands, related on one side to the manuscript, on the other to the text written; if properly compiled, it will serve not only the purpose of identifying word-forms in the main index as belonging to different hands, but it may eventually serve to identify different types of scribal collaboration and book production.

Let me amplify and illustrate the remarks made above with a few examples from the forthcoming edition of *The Troickij Florilegium* #12 (Cod. Moskva, GBL, F.304(TSL)12), notably the incipitarium, index of identifications, codicological index and main index of words and forms (the indices of biblical references and proper nouns, which I consider equally indispensable, are, unfortunately, not as yet completed). I print the samples on the left page and identify their function and organisation on the right; I take care to point out some of the additional research opportunities the text-oriented reference system offers in these indices.

For other examples of practical application of text-oriented reference systems, I refer to my publications listed below:

*The Scaliger Paterikon*, 1-3. Zug (IDC) 1976-1981.

Elementary Compilation in Slavic. *Cyrrillomethodianum* 5(1981):49-66.

Meleckij Sbornik i istorija drevnebolgarskoj literatury. *Palaeobulgarica* 6 (1982)3:154-165.

The Izbornik of John the Sinner: A Compilation from Compilations. *Polata knigopisnaja* 8(1983):15-37.

K izučeniju orfografii Izbornika 1076 goda i ego antigrafa. *Paléographie et diplomatique slaves*, 2. Sofia (in print).

НЕЖЕ ВЪ СТЫИХЪ ОЦА НАШЕГО ИШАНА ЗЛАТОУСТАГО РАЗУМН ПОЛЪЗЫНИИ ѿ АНЪ-  
АРИНАНТА И ѿ ПРОКЪЗИХЪ ЕГО ДШЕПОЛЪЗЫНИИХЪ ОУЧЕНИИ

- 296 НЕЖЕ СТЫИХЪ ШЪЗЛОБЛЕННИЕ· СМЕРЕРЪ УИСЛЪМЪ ВИНЪІ СЪТЬ· ПЪРВАТА ОУѢ 158  
297 НКО ВЕЛЫИ МОЖЕТЪ ШЕЩЕННІЕ ЦРЪКВЬНОЕ ПОМАГАТИ· АЩЕ СЪ СЪТРЕНЪМЪ 158v  
298 НКО НЕЖЕ ДОБРЪ ГЛАТИ· И ХВАЛИТИ· НАЧАЛО ЛЮБЪВЕ РЕСТЬ ТАКО ЗЛАѢ 158v  
299 НКО НИ ЕДИНА ПОЛЪЗА НАМА· ШЪЗ ЖЕСТОКАГО ЖИТИА· АЩЕ КЛѢВЕТАІ НЕ 158v  
300 НКО ШЪЗІВАИ РЕСТЬ БОУ РЕГДА СЪГРѢШАЕМЪІ· НЕ АЕНИ МЪСТИТИ ГОѢХОМ 159  
301 НКО ИСПРАВИТИ И ПРѢЛОЖИТИ СѦ· АЩЕ ЛИ ЗАНЕЖЕ НГЕ ВЪЗДААРЕТЬ· МЪНАШ 159  
302 НКО БЕЗЪ ВИНЪІ СЪІ КАЗНЬ ПРИНАТЪ ШЪНСИЦА· ИМЪ ЖЕ ГОНЕЖНОУѢ 159  
303 НКО БО БЕЗЪ ВИНЪІ ВЪПАДЕ· НАКОЖЕ РѢХЪ ИМЪМЪ ГРѢХОМЪ ПРИНАТЪ МЪСТЬ· 159  
304 НКО АЩЕ НЕ НАПАСТЬ· НИ ВѢНЬЦЪ· АЩЕ НЕ БОРЪНИ ДАРОВЕ· АЩЕ НЕ ТРОУА 159  
305 НКО НЕ ТАКО СЪМЕНА СЪНОСИМЪІІ ДЪЖАБ· ШГОИТИ ТВОРИТИ И РАСТИ· НКО 159  
306 НКО ПОДОВАРЕТЬ НАКАЗАТИ НАЗНАКА· ДА БОУДАЕТЪ СЛОУГА ДЪВЪННИ БЛГОДА 159v  
307 НКО НИУѢТОЖЕ ИМАТЪ СЪМЪРТЪ БѢДНО· НЪ СКОРѢЕ НЪ ТИХОМОУ ПРИСТАН 159v  
308 НКО СЪМЪРТЪ ШЪСЪТВИЕ ВРЪМЕНЬНО· СЪНЪ ПРОДЪЛЖЕНЪ ШЪЗІВАЮ· ТЪМЪЖ 159v  
309 НКО АЩЕ СЪГРѢШАЕТЪ КЪТО И ПОСЪКЪРЕНЪ· ГРѢХЪ ПОТРЕБИЛЪ РЕСТЬ· РА 159v  
310 НКО НИУѢТОЖЕ ТОЛИКО ШЕЩОЖЕННІЕ ПЛЪТЪСКОЕ ОУТОЛИТИ МОЖЕТЪ· НАКОЖ 160  
311 НАКОЖЕ ДШНОУГО СТРАСТЬ СЪПРАТАТИ МОЖЕТЪ· ОУТѢШЪНЪІХЪ СЛОВЕСЪ СИЛА 160  
312 НКО НЕ ТО НЕЖЕ ТВОРИТИ МЛТВОУ НА ДЪВА И НА ТРИ ДЪНИ· ДОВЪЛѢРЕТЬ И 160  
313 НАКО РЕГДА ОУДАВЛАЯЕШИ ПОВИННАГО· РЕГДА СЪВЛАУИШИ· НЪ И ПОПЪРАЛЪ 160  
314 НКО УЛЪКЪ НЕ ДЪЛЖЕНЪ РЕСТЬ ПОКРЪЗІВАТИ СѦ· ШЕРАТЪ И СЛАВА БЖИТА СЪ 160  
315 НКО АЩЕ ХОЩЕШИ БРАТА ИСПРАВИТИ· НЕ ЗЪЛО ГЛН· НЪ ПРОСЛАВИ СѦ· ПОМО 160  
316 НКО АЩЕ АЛУЕШИ ПОКАЖИ ДѢЛАІ САМЪМЪ 160v  
317 ВЪПРОСЪ· КАЦЪМЪ ДѢЛАІ· 160v  
318 ШЪЗВѢТЪ· АЩЕ ВИДИШИ ОУБЮГА ИМОУИ І· АЩЕ ИШАИ ВРАГА СЪМИРИ СѦ· А 160v  
319 НКО ПОДОВАРЕТЬ КРЪСТЬРАНОУ ВСѦ СИ ХРАНИТИ· НЕЖЕ НИКОМОУЖЕ ЗЛАѢ Г 160v  
320 НКО СЕГО РАДИ ПЕЧАЛЬ ВЪІСТЬ· НЕ ДА ШЪЗЩЕТЪ ИМЪННО· НЕ ШЪ СЪМЪРТ 160v

296-427 *Ioana Zlatoustaaго razumi polъzbnii*

Source: unidentified; cf. dependent compilation in *Knjažij Izbornik* 7 VEDER 1983:25

Greek: (296-298, 300-320, 327, 333, 369, 371) *Johannes Chrysostomus: Homiliae* 21 de *statuis ad populum Antiochenum habitae* CPG 4330: 1:5-6, 2:5-7, 3:1-2, 4-7, 4:1, 5, 5:2-4, 6:1, 12:2 Ed. PG 49:15-222 (299, 321-326, 328-332, 334-368, 370, 372-427) unidentified

428-447 *Isidora Pilusiotbskaago razumi*

Source: unidentified

Greek: (428-433, 436-446) *Isidoros Pelusiota: Epistolarum liber* 1 CPG 5557: 1, 3, 14, 25, 27, 44, 52, 94, 173, 181, 220, 277, 278, 281, 285 Ed. PG 78:177-453 (434-435, 447) unidentified

448-450 *Ot slovese ježe vřdovica eř narečeto*

Source: unidentified

Greek: unidentified

451-455 *Zlatoustaaго*

Source: unidentified

Greek: unidentified

Column 1: unit number  
 Column 2: unit incipit  
 Column 3: location of 2

Tr	Izb	Mel	Chr
296a			1:6
296b	645	431	1:6
296c	646		1:6
296d	647	432	2:6
296e	648	433	2:7
296f	649	434	3:1
296g			3:1
297	673	457	3:2
298	699	480	3:5
299	672	456	
300	650a	435a	3:7
301a	650b	435b	3:7
301b	-	-	3:7
302	-	-	3:7
303	-	-	3:7
304	-	-	4:1

Column 1: unit number  
 Column 2: text identification:  
     a. by (short) title  
     b. by (Slavic) source  
     c. by Greek original  
 (CPG : *Clavis Patrum Graecorum*)  
 (PG : *Patrologia Graeca*)

## INCIPITARIUM

The contents of the *Troickij Florilegium* are subdivided by 535 capitals or *la cunae* into textual units from 2 words up to 8½ folia long. The incipitarium lists all of them, including the titles under which they are grouped together (cf. below), and shows both their consecutive numbering and their location in the manuscript. It forms the main entry to the text-oriented reference system, representing the entire microstructure of the manuscript's contents. It is eminently useful for general structural comparison to other manuscripts (although in many cases it is necessary to look beyond the incipit, cf. units 296 and 301). As an example of the economy achieved by the use of a unit numbering, I show the correspondence of the *Florilegium* (Tr) to the *Izbornik* of 1076 (Izb) and the *Meleckij Sbornik* (Mel), as well as the corresponding Greek text (Chr). It is evident that Tr is more closely dependent upon Chr than Izb or Mel, which may well be dependent upon an ancestor of Tr.

## INDEX OF IDENTIFICATIONS

The 535 units are grouped under 83 titles (6 now lacking): 2 titles cover texts from 3 different sources each, 5 titles are covered in turn by 1 super-title. This heterologous macrostructure in which not only the manuscript data themselves, but their interpretation by the textologist as well play equally important roles, can, to my mind, best be brought to the fore in a separate index and not be integrated into the incipitarium above. This index, which also reflects in detail the degree of identification of the contents of the manuscript, will serve, together with the codicological index (cf. page 72), as a direct key for the interpretation of the data in the main index of words and forms (cf. page 72). Its separation from the incipitarium has the advantage that the incipitarium, once it is made up, remains immutable, while this index can be updated in the course of the textological research of the manuscript.

21	127-129, *33-34, 130-132	127-130:11 130:12-130:23 130v-132v	G 267b-269a F 269b G 269c-271a
22	133-140	133-140v	G 271b-278a
23	ā 141-146, *35-36	141-146v	G 278b-283
24	ē 147-154	147-154v	G 284-294a
25	ī 155-162	155-157v 158:1-158:3 158:4-162v	G 294b-295 H t296 G 296-342
26	ā 163-170	163-170:8 170:9-170v	G 343-399a I 399b-403a
27	ē 171-178	171-178v	I 403b-450a
28	ī 179-186	179-185:14 185:15-186v	I 450b-478 H 479a
29	z 187-192	187-192v	H 479b-492a
30	193-196	193-195v:3 195:4-196v	H 492b-523 J 524-529a
31	197-200	197-200v	I 529b-532
32	*37-39, 201-202, *40(41?)	201-202v	I 533-535

ā<sup>7</sup> *nam*

ā 63,64; f.68  
ā<sup>1</sup> f.58, f.141  
[ā<sup>1</sup>] f.59v  
ā + ā 474

αααα G 9<sup>2</sup>, 10, 62, 329  
ααααυ D 56, 484

αΔΟΒΞ<sup>4</sup> *adj* + αΔΞ  
αΔΟΒΑ nNpl 12  
αΔΟΒΗ mNpl 290  
αΔΟΒΟ nA 275  
αΔΟΒΟΥ nD 259

α<sup>252</sup> *conj*

1<sup>5</sup>, 2<sup>10</sup>, 3, 4, 7, 9, 29, 30, 32<sup>14</sup>, 33<sup>5</sup>, 35, 42<sup>4</sup>,  
46, 51<sup>5</sup>, 54<sup>6</sup>, 56, 57<sup>3</sup>, 61, 62<sup>11</sup>, 63<sup>10</sup>, 85, 91,  
96, 97<sup>2</sup>, 99, 101, 110, 117, 118<sup>2</sup>, 119<sup>2</sup>, 120,  
121, 129<sup>2</sup>, 135, 153, 178, 180, 192<sup>3</sup>, 205,  
210, 212<sup>4</sup>, 213, 218, 219<sup>2</sup>, 220<sup>2</sup>, 222<sup>3</sup>, 224,  
228<sup>3</sup>, 229<sup>2</sup>, 230, 231, 232<sup>2</sup>, 233, 236, 237,  
239, 241<sup>2</sup>, 245<sup>3</sup>, 247<sup>6</sup>, 248, 251, 253<sup>3</sup>, 254,  
257<sup>4</sup>, 258<sup>3</sup>, 259, 260<sup>2</sup>, 261<sup>2</sup>, 263, 264, 265,  
266, 270<sup>3</sup>, 274, 275<sup>2</sup>, 277<sup>3</sup>, 280<sup>2</sup>, 283, 284,  
294, 295<sup>2</sup>, 330, 344, 345, 353, 358, 383,  
448<sup>2</sup>, 450, 453, 479<sup>2</sup>, 492<sup>2</sup>, 510, 519, 535  
[α] 2, 535  
α ne 21, 34<sup>3</sup>, 42, 46, 55, 57, 58<sup>2</sup>, 90, 128,  
192, 213, 219, 237, 239, 253, 256, 257, 258,  
259, 275, 277<sup>2</sup>, 278<sup>2</sup>, 279, 284<sup>2</sup>, 292, 294,  
321, 364, 397, 403, 412, 430, 431, 462, 464<sup>2</sup>,  
492<sup>2</sup>, 531  
α σεβξ + οσεβξ 463

αΔΞ<sup>20</sup> m  
11, 12, 13<sup>2</sup>, 18, 21  
αΔΑ G 22<sup>2</sup>, 31  
αΔΕ V 21<sup>2</sup>  
αΔΟΥ D 11, 12, 20  
αΔΞ A 62  
αΔΞ L 34, 44, 243, 259, 479

αΔΞΚΞ<sup>4</sup> *adj* + αΔΞ  
αΔΞΚΑ nNpl 16, 17  
αΔΞΚΑ nApl 18  
αΔΞΚΞΙ nA fApl 21

αΕΡΟΧΟΔΗΞ *adj*  
αΕΡΟΧΟΔΗΞΑ mA 278

αΕΡΟΧΟΔΗΞ *adj*  
αΕΡΟΧΟΔΗΞΙΜΞ nDpl 281

αΕΡΞ<sup>2</sup> m

αΒΗΤΕ<sup>37</sup> *adv*

12, 21, 27<sup>2</sup>, 63<sup>7</sup>, 210, 212, 220, 221, 231,  
241, 243, 246, 251, 253, 267, 300, 353, 372,

# CODICOLOGICAL INDEX

Column 1: quire number  
 Column 2: original quire number  
 Column 3: folio numbering (an \* marks lacking folia)  
 Column 4: limits of hand  
 Column 5: identification of hand  
 Column 6: 4, but expressed in textual units

The *Troickij Florilegium* is made up of 32 quires (# 2 and 6 now lacking), containing 242 or 243 folia (40 or 41 now lacking), written, as far as can be ascertained now, by 10 scribes. This index shows their distribution, as well as their relation to the text written. It forms, together with the index of identifications (and/or the incipitarium, cf. page 71), the key to the interpretation of the data in the main index of words and forms (cf. below). Independently, it visualises how the scribes have staggered their work, never handing over the pen at seams between texts from different sources, adding quires of irregular length to the book block as their work neared its completion. These data clearly point to copying rather than compiling. The original quire numbering 1-12 + 1-20 without a break in text requires more comparable codicological indices for an explanation.

## MAIN INDEX OF WORDS AND FORMS

Heading in capitals: lemma according to the *Slovník jazyka staroslověnského*  
 Forms in lower case: manuscript forms, differing in spelling or function from the heading  
 Italics: identification of category  
 Superscript number: frequency  
 →: to be read as  
 ←: pertaining to

All references are to textual units, save when preceded by *f.* (= folio, i.e. writing *not* belonging to the text); a *t* marks a title, preceding a given unit.

The *Florilegium's* ca. 50000 occurrences of ca. 5000 words (many of them not attested previously) can be presented in this index in a highly economical and legible fashion. The use of textual references offers more advantages: (1) it makes it possible to specify whether a form belongs to a text written in ink or a title written in cinnabar (in conjunction with the above index even the scribes can be roughly distinguished), or else whether it does not belong to the text at all; (2) it makes it possible to use the index for linguistic research independently from the manuscript, e.g. to note the high incidence of the conjunction *a* in Chrysostomus-texts (1-54, 269-427) versus its virtual non-existence in Ephraim-texts (209-210, 494-509), or to note the distinction of *ааоѡѡ* and *ааѡѡѡ* in the Chrysostomus-text 3-31 versus their non-distinction in the Antiochus-text 211-295; (3) it makes it possible to compare the vocabulary of text versions without constant recourse to the complete manuscripts involved.

- НА И СТРАСТНА МЪНѢТИ· НАКО ИЖЕ БЛА  
ГЪИМЪ КЪРМА СѦ НАДЕЖАМЪ· И Ш БОУДОУ  
ЩИХЪ ОУПОВАНА· ШЕУДОУ ОУЖЕ ЦРѢСТВИНА ВЪ  
КОУСИЛЪ· НАКО ПОДОБАЕТЕЪ РАЗОУМѢТИ  
5 НАШЕ КЕСТЬСТВО· ПОМЪИШЛАТИ ГРѢХЪ·  
ВѢДѢТИ УТО КЕСМЪ И ДОВЛѢТЕТЬ СЕ НАМЪ·  
НА ВСАКО СЪМѢРНОМОУДРѢСТВО ОУКАЗА  
НИИ· НАКО БОГАТА ТА СЪТВОРИ БѢ· ДА ТРЕ  
БОУЮЩИМЪ ПОМАГАЕШИ· ДА ГРѢХЪ РА  
10 ЗАРЪШИШИ СВОЕГО МИЛОСТЫННИЧЕГО· НАКО  
КРОТКА ТВОРИШИ ГОРЬНАГО СОУДНИГО· НЕ  
ЖЕ НА КЛЕВРѢТѢХЪ УЛѢКОЛЮБИТЕМЪ·  
НАКО НЕ НАДЕНИТЕ И ШЕБДАННИТЕ· ШБОТЕ ВЪ  
ДѢНИТЕ ШЕЗІУДИ ИМОУТЬ ТВОРИТИ · (297) НА  
15 КО ВЕЛЫМЪ МОЖЕТЕЪ ШБЪЩЕНИТЕ ЦРѢКЪВЪ  
НОТЕ ПОМАГАТИ· АЩЕ СЪ СЪТРЕНЪМЪ СЪ  
РАЦМЪ МЛѢВЪИ ВЪЗНОСИМЪ · (298) НАКО РЕЖЕ  
ДОВРѢ ГЛѢТИ· И ХВАЛИТИ· НАУАЛО ЛЮБЕЪ  
ВЕ КЕСТЬ ТАКО УЗЛѢ ГЛѢТИ И КЛЕВЕТАТИ  
20 ВРАЖЪДЪИ И НЕНАВИСТИ· И ТЪМАМИ РАТИ  
И НАУАЛО И ВІНА БЪЗІВАЕТЕЪ · (299) НАКО НИТЕ (299) Izb672 Mel456 Chr-  
ДИНА ПОЛЬЗА НАМЪ· ШТЪ ЖЕСТОКАГО  
ЖИТИНА· АЩЕ КЛЕВЕТАЪ НЕ ШТАНЕМЪ СѦ ·

23 сѦ was under 23

To conclude, I reproduce a sample page from the forthcoming edition of *The Troickij Florilegium* # 12. Note that the unit numbering is introduced into the printed text; note also that, since the textological analysis has shown that all texts are copied or compiled from earlier Slavic manuscripts, the identification of Slavic parallels, even if remote, takes precedence over the identification of Greek originals in the right hand margin.